

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JULIO M. LOPEZ,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 05-03096-01-CR-S-RED

ORDER

Pending before the Court are Defendant's Pro Se Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 216), Pro Se Supplemental Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 240), and a Pro Se Motion for Disclosure of Impeaching Information (Doc. 255).

Defendant is represented by counsel and was so represented at the time he made these motions. The scheduling and trial order (Doc. 172) provides "pro se pleadings will not be accepted for defendants who are represented by counsel." This directive follows the Eighth Circuit's articulation in *United States v. Hale*, 978 F.2d 1016, 1018, n.2 (8th Cir. 1982), where the Appellate Court stated that the district court "has no obligation to entertain pro se motions filed by a represented party."

On January 6, 2006, United States Magistrate Judge James C. England issued his Report and Recommendations (Doc. 264). No objections to the Report and Recommendations have been filed.

Upon careful and independent review of the pending motions and a review of the applicable law, the Court hereby adopts and incorporates as its own opinion and order, the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James C. England.

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that Defendant's Pro Se Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 216), Pro Se Supplemental Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 240), and a Pro Se Motion for Disclosure of Impeaching Information (Doc. 255) are overruled and denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATE: February 23, 2006

/s/ Richard E. Dorr

RICHARD E. DORR, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT